Construction of a Bridge over the Cauvery at Bannur.

Q.—20. **Mr. M. MAYIGOWDA** (T.-Narsipur Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether an estimate had been prepared for the construction of a bridge across the Cauvery at Bannur and, if so, the amount of the estimate ;

(*b*) (i) whether statistics were collected to ascertain the probable income accruing from levying toll on traffic over the proposed bridge ; (ii) what that income is ; (iii) whether another attempt is being made to collect fresh statistics ;

(*c*) (i) whether there is a proposal to build a causeway across the river at Bannur ; (ii) whether an estimate for the said work has been prepared ; (iii) if so, the amount ;

(*d*) whether the question of the construction of the bridge was not discussed for many years in this Assembly and finally decided that the bridge was necessary ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT** (Mr. N. Sarabhoja).—

(*a*) No detailed estimate is prepared. Roughly it would cost about Rs. 5 lakhs.

(*b*) (i) to (iii) The answer is in the negative.

(*c*) (i) Yes.

(ii) and (iii) The estimate for the causeway is under preparation.

(*d*) The question has been discussed, but after the construction of the bridges across the Cauvery and Kapini near T.-Narasipur, the bridge near Bannur is considered not urgent.

Mr. MAYI GOWDA.—Bannur is a very big village with a land revenue demand of Rs. 30,000. The residents of that place are experiencing a considerable amount of trouble for want of a bridge. May I therefore suggest that in place of a causeway the Government be pleased to construct a regular bridge ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—We have to consider the cost which it would involve, the necessity for incurring that expenditure, whether any other bridges are more urgently required, etc., before taking up construction of the bridge which the member is suggesting.

Mr. MAYI GOWDA.—There can be no doubt about the necessity for a bridge, even from the point of view of heavy traffic at the place.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—We shall note your suggestion.

Construction of a Bridge over the Arkavati near Kankanhalli.

Q.—1. **Messrs. B. S. SIDDAPPA** (Kankanhalli Taluk) and **K. P. PARASIVAIYA** (Kankanhalli Municipality).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the year in which the estimate for constructing a bridge across the Arkavati near Kankanhalli was prepared originally ;

(*b*) the amount of the estimate, so prepared ;

(*c*) whether any revised estimate to suit the present conditions has been prepared ;

(*d*) the amount of the revised estimate ;

(*e*) whether this work has been included in the programme of bridges to be constructed ;

(*f*) the number of bridges intended to be completed before taking up this work ;

(*g*) whether Government intend taking up this work during the current year ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT** (Mr. N. Sarabhoja).—

(*a*) In the year 1935.

(*b*) Two alternative estimates were prepared, one costing Rs. 1,19,350, and the other Rs. 1,31,475.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) Rs. 1,25,000.

(*e*) Yes.

(*f*) No such thing is contemplated.

(*g*) This is under consideration.

Mr. B. S. SIDDAPPA.—With reference to the answer to question (*g*), will the Government be pleased to state exactly when the work will be taken on hand?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—As soon as possible.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—The District Board has also resolved to bear its share of expenditure if the scheme is sanctioned. In that view will the Government please expedite sanction to the scheme?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Very well.

Q.—66. **Lokasevaparayane D. SAKAMMA (Women's Interest).**—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the number of lady representatives in the several public bodies?

(*b*) the percentage they bear to the women population of the State?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT (Mr. C. Subrahmanya Aiyar).**—

(*a*) (i) Representative Assembly		6
(ii) School Boards	...	9
(iii) Village Panchayats	...	2
(iv) Municipal Councils	...	6
(v) District Boards	...	9
(vi) Senate	...	5
Total	...	37

(*b*) 37 out of population of 3,203,339 according to the census of 1931.

Lokasevaparayane D. SAKAMMA.—The total women population of the State is 23 lakhs. There is not even one representative of theirs on the Legislative Council.

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasaktha (B. T. Kesavaiengar).—The question of giving them representation in the Legislative Council, if possible, is under consideration.

Lokasevaparayane D. SAKAMMA.—In giving representation to special interests, will the Government be pleased to consider the case of village interests also?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—So long as there are qualified representatives, it is the same whether they come from villages or towns. The suggestion will however be considered at the time of framing rules.

REPRESENTATIONS—*concld.*

No. 75: Re-valuation of answer papers of the University Examinations—concld.

At this stage, **Mr. K. MARULAPPA** sought permission of the Chair to make a submission with reference to Representation No. 75 already discussed on the fifth day.

He said that there were many poor boys who daily went from door to door in quest of food, and managed, with a great deal of difficulty, to prosecute their studies in the colleges. And they would naturally be very much upset if they did not pass in the University examinations. Some of them were intelligent and hard-working students and might have reasonable hope of securing a pass if their papers were re-valued. After all, it was only those who were confident of having done well in the examination that would ask for re-valuation. He therefore prayed that a provision be made in the University Act to the effect that answer papers might be re-valued on application and deposit of a prescribed fee.

The PRESIDENT promised that the representation would be considered.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 5.

Raising the Weirs of Tanks.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA moved the following resolution:—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that, as several tanks are silted up and their capacity is reduced, the question of raising the weirs of the tanks in one series be investigated and, if advisable, the work be taken up."

He stated that Government had already been doing a lot in the direction of restoring major and minor tanks, but in many cases, due to accumulation of silt, the capacity of tanks was going down every year. If at least the waste